

### REMARKS

Reconsideration and further prosecution of the above-identified application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and discussion that follows. Claims 1-32 are pending in the prior application.

#### Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-32 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Pat. No. 5,999,964 to Lennig et al. in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,029,124 to Gillick et al. and U.S. Pat. No. 5,475,733 to Eisdorfer et al. In view of claims as presently amended, applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Independent claims 1, 7, 13, 19 and 25 have been amended to more clearly claim the invention in the context of an automatic call distributor. Support for routing of calls based upon an initial greeting from the caller may be found in numerous locations within the specification (e.g., page 3, lines 16-19, page 5, lines 6-8, etc.). Support for routing a call to a response service may be found at page 3, lines 7-9. In this regard, "While skill based methods for routing calls are commonly found in modern ACD systems, there is no known analogous development of a language based method of routing calls" (specification, page 2, lines 3-5).

It is noted next that of the combination (of Kelly, Lennig et al., Gillick et al. and Eisendorfer et al.), Lennig et al. and Eisendorfer et al. teach that language selection should be performed by the caller. Gillick et

al. is merely directed to language identification without any practical application outside of the usefulness of speech recognition. Similarly, Kelly is merely directed to call routing. Nowhere within the combination of Kelly, Lennig et al., Gillick et al. and Eisendorfer et al.), Lennig et al. and Eisendorfer et al. is there any teaching or suggestion that an initial greeting offered by a customer could or should be used to route a call.

Since there is no teaching or suggestion of the use of a greeting to route a call, the combination fails to teach each and every claim limitation. Since the combination fails to teach each and every claim limitation, the rejection is believed to be improper and should be withdrawn.


#### Closing Remarks

Allowance of claims 1-32, as now presented, is believed to be in order and such action is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of the subject application, he is respectfully requested to telephone applicant's undersigned attorney.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fee which may be required for this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.18, including but not limited to the issue fee, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 23-0920. Should no proper amount be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal, or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 23-0920. A

duplicate copy of this sheet(s) is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,  
WELSH & KATZ, LTD.

By   
Jon P. Christensen  
Registration No. 34,137

August 4, 2004  
WELSH & KATZ, LTD.  
120 South Riverside Plaza  
22nd Floor  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 655-1500